

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-3 and 5-32 are currently pending in this application. No new matter has been added by way of the present amendment. All of the amendments to the claims are merely editorial in nature to better conform the language of the claims to U.S. practice, and to address issues under 35 U.S.C. 112 previously identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, no new matter has been added.

In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all outstanding rejections and allow the currently pending claims.

Issues Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph

Claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner asserts that claim 32 recites a circumferential nonuniformity or in-plane nonuniformity of the electrical resistance of the conductive member of "less than 1.5". However, the Examiner asserts that Applicants' Specification recites values of 1.0 to 1.3.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 32 has been amended to recite a circumferential nonuniformity or in-plane nonuniformity of the electrical resistance of the conductive member of from 1.0 to 1.15, which finds support at page 99, lines 14-17 of the present Specification. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

Issues Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph

Claims 1-3 and 3-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner asserts that the phrases “volume resistivity electrical resistance” in claims 1, 31 and 32, and “second discontinuous phase” in claims 10 and 11 are indefinite. The Examiner further asserts that the percentages in claim 29 conflict with those in claim 21, on which it depends.

As to the rejection of claims 1, 10-11 and 31-32, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims have been amended to overcome the issues identified by the Examiner. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims is moot.

As to the rejection of claim 29, Applicants submit that the weight percentage in claim 29 does not conflict with the weight percentages in claim 21. The weight percentage in claim 21 relates to a conductive master batch or a thermoplastic composition.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are thus respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner asserts that claims 1-3 and 5-32 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first and second paragraphs, set forth in the Office Action of October 19, 2007.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. In view of the amendments and remarks herein, Applicants submit that all presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

A Notice of Allowability is thus respectfully requested.

Conclusion


All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and objections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Andrew D. Meikle, Reg. No. 32,868 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: **February 19, 2008**

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Andrew D. Meikle
Registration No.: 32,868
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant